



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VII. — *The Carrière of the Higher Roman Officials in Egypt in the Second Century*

By DR. SUSAN H. BALLOU

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

ESPECIAL interest attaches to the investigation of all questions that are concerned with the administration of ancient Egypt in the Roman period. This is partly due to the peculiar position of Egypt among the provinces of Rome, arising from the way in which it was acquired, as the special and private possession of Augustus, and to the way in which he chose to govern it, by preserving, according to his usual conservative policy, at least the outward forms of administration which had been employed by his predecessors, the Ptolemies. Interest is moreover very greatly enhanced by the recent widening of the field of research through the discovery and publication of the Egyptian papyri. The vast amount of first-hand source material which is thereby poured forth in almost bewildering profusion inevitably necessitates a complete revision of the earlier information drawn from literary and epigraphical sources and from the earlier-known papyri. There is no very recent treatment of the special phase of the administration of Egypt which forms the subject of the present paper.¹ In view of the great amount of new

¹ The basic books are still O. Hirschfeld's *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*², Berlin, 1905; Paul M. Meyer's list of the prefects of Egypt in *Das Heerwesen der Ptolemäer und Römer*, Leipzig, 1900; and V. Martin's *Les Épistatèges*, Geneva, 1911. Besides these, the compendious little book of H. Mattingly, entitled *The Imperial Civil Service of Rome* (Cambridge, 1910) is very useful, but attempts no special treatment of the imperial government of Egypt (cf. p. 128). These have been supplemented by articles in *Hermes* and other journals, and in the *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*. In R. H. Lacey's *The Equestrian Officials of Trajan and Hadrian: their Careers, with Notes on Hadrian's Reforms* (Princeton diss. 1917), discussion of individual officials supplies occasional information regarding posts in Egypt. No complete treatment of the Egyptian officials has been made for a decade, as far as the present writer can learn.

material now available, investigation is bound to be fertile in results, and a summarization of the information which can be obtained up to the present time is much to be desired.

This paper does not, however, attempt a complete treatment, but presents a few notes on the results of some preliminary research. By no means has the writer been able to cover all the papyrus material, as must in time be done. The present study has been limited to the second century, as being the period following upon the general administrative reforms of the Emperor Hadrian, in which the Egyptian offices became more regularized and defined. At the other end, it includes the reign of Septimius Severus, practical man of affairs, who was the second important factor, after Augustus, in the reorganization, especially on the financial side, of the imperial government. Here, if anywhere, one may expect to find the appointments to the administrative offices in Egypt following some formal scheme, which will permit the reconstruction of a definite *carrière* or *cursus honorum*.

It will be remembered that in the government of Egypt the highest official was not a procurator, as in the other Roman provinces, but a governor appointed by the emperor to be his viceroy, and therefore to hold the same relation to the rest of the administrative machinery that the Ptolemaic kings had had. He bore the title of Prefect of Egypt, or more fully, he was *praefectus Alexandriae et Aegypti*, for he had his seat at the capital city. In the Greek inscriptions he appears as ἑπαρχος Αἰγύπτου, but in the papyri usually as ἡγεμων. This highest official was regularly a Roman. The single certain exception known is Ti. Julius Alexander, chief of staff of Titus at the capture of Jerusalem, who was a native Egyptian. Very early Augustus, after experimenting at first with freedmen, bestowed the office, not upon men of senatorial rank, but upon Roman knights.

The officials next in rank under the *praefectus* were, on the legal side, the *iuridicus* (in Greek δικαιοδότης), and in the financial administration the *idiologus* (ἴδιος λόγος), the

latter a title retained from Ptolemaic times. These officials, while under the prefect, were directly connected with the emperor himself, and could only be removed by him. It is not within the present purpose to go into the matter of a precise definition of their jurisdiction and duties. The point of interest at this time is that the Roman knights were appointed to these offices also. On the other hand, the under-officials, employed in the bureau of the *idiologus*, called *procuratores usiaci* (in Greek ἐπίτροποι τῶν οὐσιακῶν), were regularly freedmen, at least down to the time of Septimius Severus, who for a time put Roman knights into these subordinate places also.

Over each of the three great administrative divisions of Egypt an *epistrategus* was in charge.² This title was retained from the Ptolemaic government, but the office itself was stripped of all its previous military significance, and was purely administrative and financial under the Romans. The *epistrategi* also were regularly Roman knights. Their subordinates, the *σπαρτηγοί*, placed each in charge of a separate territorial subdivision or district, were not Romans but Greeks or Greco-Egyptians, as their names indicate. They, as also the subordinates of the *idiologus*, were separated by a wide gap from the upper officials. Therefore their positions cannot be regarded as forming steps in a *cursus honorum*, leading to the superior posts of the Roman knights. There were then no offices in Egypt itself, below the rank of *idiologus*, *iuridicus*, or *epistrategus*, from which a Roman knight could rise to the higher grades. To the question whether an *idiologus*, a *iuridicus*, or an *epistrategus* could rise to be *praefectus* in Egypt we will return later.

In regard to the prefecture, the more recent publications

² The whole province of Egypt was divided into three great governmental units, the Thebaïd, the Delta, and the division comprising the Seven Nomes and the Arsinoïte Nome, known as *epistrategiae Septem Nomorum et Arsinoïtae*. It is in this last territorial division that the largest finds of papyri have been made, so that the great body of our information is directly or indirectly concerned with this middle region of Egypt.

of the papyri not only confirm in many cases the names already known of prefects of the second century, but also furnish us with certain corrections in our list, as well as a number of new names. These additional names are significant, since they fill some gaps and remove some uncertainties previously existing. This is also especially true for the third and fourth centuries, concerning which Meyer, whose list is used throughout this discussion as a basis (see note 1), had but scanty information. The following instances will serve to illustrate the changes which even incomplete investigation renders necessary at certain points.

In Meyer's list of the prefects of Egypt, after the name of C. Pomponius Planta with a term covering the years 96-99, a period of five years is without incumbent; then follow C. Vibius Maximus, 104, and C. Minicius Itala, 105. The date of the former is certain, being obtained from an inscription on the right foot of the Memnon (*C.I.L.* III, 38), declaring that he as *praefectus Aegypti* heard its voice in the seventh year of the Emperor Trajan. The date 105 for Minicius Itala rests upon an inscription set up to him in Aquileia in that year, and giving what was doubtless his whole *cursus honorum* at that time, ending with *praefectus Aegypti*. It is however not necessary to assume that he held that office in 105 — indeed the probability is that he did not, since the stone is not Egyptian. We now learn from *Pap. Oxyr.* VII, 1022 that he was *praefectus* in February, 103. His term must therefore be placed before that of Vibius Maximus instead of after it. The editor of this document cites also, in confirmation of the new date for Minicius Itala, *Pap. Amh.* 64 and "the correct reading of *B.G.U.* 908, 9 in *Arch. f. Pap.* II, 137." The reconstructed list at this point should now read: C. Pomponius Planta, 96-99; C. Minicius Itala, 103; C. Vibius Maximus, 103-104.

The term of Q. Rhamnius Martialis, who was formerly assigned to the year 118 on the basis of two Greek inscriptions, should now be extended in both directions. *Pap. Oxyr.* VII,

1023, 6-8 takes him back to the first year of Hadrian's reign, while *Pap. Oxyr.* XII, 1547, 4 shows him to have been still in office in 119. It seems not improbable that he had no successor before Haterius Nepos, the beginning and end of whose term, 121-124, have been ascertained respectively from a Latin inscription (*C.I.L.* XI, 5213) and from *Pap. Rain.* 1492.

There follow in Meyer's list T. Flavius Titianus, 126-131, and Sex. Petronius Mamertinus, 134-138. *Pap. Ryl.* 113 furnishes information which lessens the vacant years between their two terms and renders an intervening incumbent very unlikely. We may now read: T. Flavius Titianus, 126-132, and Mamertinus, 133-138. In *Pap. Ryl.* 74, 1 the praenomen of the latter seems certainly [Μάρ]κος, and not Sextus.³

The prefecture of M. Sempronius Liberalis was assigned by Meyer to the years 154-156, on the basis of two Berlin papyri, which assure for him the years 154 and 155. Thinking that he alone could have been the Αὐγυστάλιος ἑπαρχος who was killed in an uprising in Egypt while the Emperor Antoninus Pius was in that country, Meyer reckons the date of the death of Sempronius Liberalis as 156.⁴ And in the following years, about which he felt some doubt, he listed Valerius Eudaelmon, 157/158; L. Volusius Maecianus, 159-161; and Postumus, 161. Following these comes M. Annius Syriacus, 162/163. New light now comes from recently published papyri. *Pap. Oxyr.* VII, 1032 shows Sempronius Liberalis to have been prefect still in the 20th year of Antoninus Pius, *i.e.* 156/157. In *Pap. Ryl.* 78, to be dated in 157, the same man is ἡγεμῶν; and *Pap. Ryl.* 271 refers to a Sempronius Liberalis who was prefect in the 23rd year of Antoninus, *i.e.* 159/160. According to these data, the term of Liberalis must have covered the years from 154 to 159. The name of Valerius Eudaemon, which had been listed for 157/158, must be shifted to an earlier date, as appears from *Pap. Oxyr.* VI, 899, 29, which

³ As it appears in *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, III, 212, and in Meyer's list.

⁴ *Herm.* XXXII (1897), 224-225.

mentions a decision rendered by him while prefect in one of the earlier years of Antoninus Pius.⁵ And the supposed prefecture of Postumus in 161 may be finally dismissed, as the editor of *Pap. Oxyr.* III, 653 remarks; and he continues: "the prefecture of L. Volusius Maecianus may occupy the whole period between the prefectures of M. Sempronius Liberalis and M. Annius Syriacus."⁶ The revised list is as follows: M. Sempronius Liberalis, 154-159; L. Volusius Maecianus, 159-162; M. Annius Syriacus, 162-163.

Two new names, not previously known from any other source, are now obtained. Flavius Sulpicius Similis, according to *Pap. Oxyr.* II, 237, col. 8, 21, was ἐπαρχος Αἰγύπτου in Nov., 182. The same name occurs in *Pap. Oxyr.* IV, 712, 22, a document in bad condition but probably of Commodus' reign. From another Oxyrhynchus papyrus, II, 237, we get the name of Pomponius Faustianus as prefect in the 26th year of Commodus. The names previously listed at this place are Flavius Priscus, 181; P. Maenius Flavianus, 182/183; Longaeus Rufus, 184/185. The name of Flavius Priscus rests upon a restoration; the correct name of Flavianus is uncertain.⁷ Both will now have to be removed, for the new information leads to the conclusion that Sulpicius Similis preceded Longaeus Rufus, while Faustianus must have succeeded him sometime between September, 185 and January, 186. The list then reads: Flavius Sulpicius Similis, 182; Longaeus Rufus, 184-185; Pomponius Faustianus, 185/186.

Another new name, that of Larcus Memor, for the year 192, is added by *Pap. Ryl.* 77, 38, and must come between M. Aurelius Papirius Dionysius, who is listed "vor 189", and L. Mantennius Sabinus, whose exact term is also in doubt.

A previously unknown prefect of the name of Magnus Felix Crescentillianus appears in *Pap. Oxyr.* IX, 1185. The

⁵ The editor reads the 5th year, but the numeral is uncertain.

⁶ The prefecture of Maecianus has been the subject of much debate; see *Herm.* XXXIII (1898), 262 f.

⁷ Cf. *Pros. Imp. Rom.* II, 321. Note the confusion possible through the similarity in the names Flavius Priscus, Flavius Similis, Maenius Flavianus.

papyrus bears no date, but since it was accompanied by a document of the reign of Severus, the editor thinks it of that period, and is inclined to place the new man in the gap which occurs in the list between 197 and 201. But new information concerning the prefect formerly known for 197, namely Aemilius Saturninus, makes it necessary to defer placing Crescentillianus till more certain data concerning him are available. The position of Saturninus in the list has depended upon *B.G.U.* 15, which is a letter addressed to the *strategi septem nomorum*, without designation of the title of the official issuing it. The *Prosopographia* suggests he was *epistrategus*, and is inclined to identify him with the Aemilius Saturninus who was *praefectus praetorio* in 200 (Dio, LXXV, 14, 2). Meyer argues that he could not have been *epistrategus* in 197 and pretorian prefect in 200, the interval between the two offices being too brief. New information from *Pap. Oxyr.* VI, 916, 10, puts his status beyond question. For in this document Saturninus is ἡγεμών in the sixth year of Severus, i.e. 198/199. Furthermore *Pap. Oxyr.* VI, 899 shows the same man to have been prefect in the seventh year of an emperor whose name is not given, but who must be Severus. It is clear that Saturninus was still prefect by June, 199, so that we now have for him a term of at least three years, 197-199.

The next prefect on the list is Q. Maecius Laetus,⁸ assigned to 201; then follows Subatianus Aquila with the term 201-207. *Pap. Oxyr.* XII, 1548, 5 makes it certain that Laetus remained in office to September, 202, probably continuing into 203. The term of Subatianus could not, then, have begun until that time.⁹ Maecius Laetus we know was pretorian prefect in 205. Considering the customary close succession of this office upon that of *praefectus Aegypti*,¹⁰ it is probable that Laetus retained the latter position till 204. This would not unduly

⁸ Cf. the editor's note on *Pap. Oxyr.* VI, 899, 10.

⁹ See note on *Pap. Oxyr.* VIII, 1111, col. I, 3.

¹⁰ See below, pp. 104 f.

shorten the term of Subatianus Aquila as pretorian prefect, in which office, it would seem from *Pap. Flor.* 6, he continued at least down to July 23, 210.

The considerable vacancy which next occurs in Meyer's list we can now at least partially fill. *Pap. Oxyr.* xii, 1408 furnishes the name of L. Baebius Aurelius Iuncinus, also known from *Pap. Giess.* 40, col. 2, 14 to have been in office on Jan. 29, 213. Septimius Heraclitus, who entered upon his office March 16, 215 (*B.G.U.* 362, col. 7, 8), was probably his immediate successor. Baebius may very well have had a term of five years, 210-215. The discovery of his Egyptian prefecture is interesting in view of the fact that we have had his previous career in a Latin inscription (*C.I.L.* x, 7580), but did not know that he attained the highest Egyptian office. Our reconstructed list at this point now reads: Aemilius Saturninus, 197-199/200; Maecius Laetus, 201-204; Subatianus Aquila, 204-210; L. Baebius Aurelius Iuncinus, 210-214.

While still far from complete, the rearrangements and corrections thus far made in the list of prefects lead to certain interesting conclusions. Some previously uncertain incumbents of the office, whose position on the list has rested upon the conjectured restoration of inscriptions or of documents on papyrus, may now be eliminated. Others, for whom the dates were conjectural, may be shifted to other positions, to be determined as our information increases. In some cases, the term of office is considerably extended by the more recent data. The general tendency of these changes is toward a greater average length of tenure than used to appear. Hirschfeld, *op. cit.* 348, remarks that the office of the prefect had no fixed term, and gives as example of a very long tenure that of the uncle of Seneca, which lasted 16 years. He states also that terms of 5-6 years are attested. The case of Seneca's uncle, Vitrasius Pollio, occurs in the middle of the not yet regularized first century. For the second century the term of 5-6 years may prove to be the rule rather than the exception. Certainly the reconstructed list for the reigns

of Hadrian and his immediate successor approaches such uniformity. This list is as follows:

- 117-121, Q. Rhamnius Martialis
- 121-126, T. Haterius Nepos
- 126-132, T. Flavius Titianus
- 133-138, M. Petronius Mamertinus
- 138-144, C. Avidius Heliodorus.

Three names concerning which there is some uncertainty as to tenure follow. Then come other consistent examples:

- 154-159, M. Sempronius Liberalis
- 159-162, L. Volusius Maecianus.

The reconstructed list also furnishes more exact information concerning the relation which the office of *praefectus praetorio* bore to that of *praefectus Aegypti*. It has long been known from the inscriptions that the prefecture of the pretorian guard at Rome was the highest of the knight's offices, and that it was held after the Egyptian prefecture.¹¹ Of the eight cases of this succession of offices which the writer has been able to find between the year 95 and the end of the reign of Septimius Severus, there are five for which the exact dates of both offices are available. In all of these datable cases, there was no interval of time between the two offices, as appears in the following table:

- T. Petronius Secundus, prefect of Egypt in 95, pretorian prefect in 96
- M. Petronius Mamertinus, prefect of Egypt, 133-138, pretorian prefect, 139-143
- M. Bassaeus Rufus, prefect of Egypt, 166-168, pretorian prefect, 168-177
- Aemilius Saturninus, prefect of Egypt, 197-199, pretorian prefect, 200 (killed in that year).

The fifth case is that of C. Calvisius Statianus, who was prefect of Egypt from probably 171 to 175, when the revolution

¹¹ Cf. Mattingly, *op. cit.* 92 f.

of Avidius Cassius broke out. Sympathizing with that rebel, Calvisius was designated by him pretorian prefect. Naturally he never attained that office, but it is clear that it was deemed to be in regular and immediate succession to the prefecture of Egypt. In other cases the offices were held in this succession but the dates are not certainly known. For example, C. Sulpicius Similis, prefect of Egypt in 106-109, was pretorian prefect under Trajan, and was given a successor by Hadrian in 117. If he became pretorian prefect as early as 110, it would not have given him an unduly long term. The case of Maecius Laetus has already been mentioned.

These were the two offices in which the career open to the Roman knights culminated.¹² The preliminary offices in which the knight gained his preparation in civil service for the highest positions are now to be considered, and we return to the question whether the positions of secondary grade in Egypt were among these.

The introductory stages are well known from the inscriptions. The young knight held certain minor military offices in the Roman army,¹³ and from these advanced to his civil service, which regularly included the procuratorship of some province or provinces other than Egypt. Usually more than one of these were held. The office of *praefectus annonae*¹⁴ at

¹² Instances are known of knights who, after a long and full career of offices, were honored with the consular insignia or were even actually made consul. Maecius Laetus was *consul iterum*, probably so called from having received the consular insignia during his pretorian prefecture. T. Pactumeius Magnus, *praefectus Aegypti* in 177-180, was *consul suffectus* in 183. And C. Fulvius Plautianus, after being *praefectus praetorio* in 197, was *ornamentis consularibus honoratus*, then *in senatum adlectus*, and in 203 *consul ordinarius, dictus cos. II*. The *cursus* of M. Bassaeus Rufus (given by Mattingly, *op. cit.* 94) is remarkably full and interesting, since he rose from the rank of noncommissioned officer to the rank of knight, and then fulfilled its utmost possibilities. He received among a long list of special honors that of the consular insignia.

¹³ Examples may be studied, selected by Mattingly, *op. cit.* 94 f. For the occasional omission of the preliminary military offices in the case of knights holding responsible posts under the Emperor Hadrian, see Lacey, *op. cit.* 38 f.

¹⁴ The activities of this official seem to have been chiefly confined to the city, and consisted in providing the capital with a supply of grain, oil, and other

Rome seems to have been bestowed next before the Egyptian pretorship, at least after the early years of the Empire. In the *cursus* of Roman knights which are obtainable from the inscriptions from the time of the Flavian emperors to that of Septimius Severus, there appear eight cases of prefects of Egypt who held the two offices in this order. The exact dates of both offices are known for only two of these cases. In one there was an interval of three years, but this was still in the first century. In the other there was no interval between the two offices.¹⁵ The position of *praefectus vigilum* of the city of Rome also stood high in the *cursus* of the knight, being held apparently just before the prefecture of the grain-supply.¹⁶ This succession occurs in one of the two instances of the office known to the writer. In the other, the man was *praefectus vigilum* just before being Egyptian prefect, and the office of *praefectus annonae* was not held.

It is not necessary to enumerate here the various offices, below these in scale, which are known to have been open to Roman knights. Among them the positions of secondary rank in Egypt seem to have no regular place. It becomes interesting then, in connection with our subject, to find out whether the *idiologus*, the *iuridicus*, and the *epistrategus* ever rose to be prefect of Egypt. For the *epistrategus*, a comparison of Martin's list of the *epistrategi* with Meyer's list of the *praefecti* shows but a single instance of the same man holding both offices. This is Ti. Julius Alexander, *epistrategus* of the Thebaïd in 42 and *praefectus Aegypti* in 67-69. His case, in

foods, in managing the funds, and supervising the sea-captains and the bakers (Mattingly, *op. cit.* 91).

¹⁵ The dated cases are: L. Laberius Maximus, *praef. ann.* 80, *praef. Aeg.* 83; and Valerius Proculus, *praef. ann.* 144, *praef. Aeg.* 145-147. The others are C. Tettius Africanus, *praef. Aeg.* 82; C. Minicius Itala, *praef. Aeg.* 103; C. Sulpicius Similis, *praef. Aeg.* 106-109; M. Petronius Honoratus, *praef. Aeg.* 148; M. Bassaeus Rufus, *praef. Aeg.* 166-168. M. Papirius Dionysius, *praef. Aeg.* 188, was reduced by Commodus to the office of *praefectus annonae* again, and died in 189.

¹⁶ So Mattingly, *op. cit.* 91, who describes the duties of this post as judicial and administrative as well as military.

other respects exceptional,¹⁷ falls in the first century. In the *cursus* of knights that are known, no other example occurs of an *epistrategus* becoming *praefectus*. And yet here and there in discussions concerning the identification of various prefects, this succession seems to be assumed as a natural one.¹⁸

For the period we are considering, there are two *epistrategi* on Martin's list, both of the Heptanomis, whose careers have come down to us. One of these, C. Camurius Clemens, held the office in Trajan's reign, the other, Ti. Claudius Xenophon, in that of Commodus, so that by chance evidence comes from the two extremes of our period only. In the *cursus* of Clemens, the preliminary military offices of the Roman knight, preceding his civil service, appear in the order in which they were regularly held (see Mattingly, *op. cit.* 65 f.). The *cursus* of Xenophon lacks them, whether or not he ever held them (cf. Lacey, *op. cit.* 38 f.). After these preliminary offices, Clemens held the procuratorship of one of the less important provinces, and then became *epistrategus* of the Seven Nomes and the Arsinoïte Nome. The *cursus* of Xenophon (whose name occurs also in *Pap. Oxÿr.* iv, 718 and again in an unpublished Cornell papyrus), is more interesting. He was procurator successively of three of the more important provinces, and then was *procurator in Aegypto ad epistrategiam septem nomorum et Arsinoïtum* (*sic*). Later he held the post of *procurator viarum urbis* — at Rome of course. In no respect do the careers of these men differ from those of *praefecti*, as far as concerns the preliminary offices. And yet following these, they became *epistrategus* instead of *praefectus* in Egypt.

As for the *iuridicus*, he was the official to whom naturally the charge of the administration was committed in the ab-

¹⁷ See above, p. 87.

¹⁸ E. g. see *Herm.* xxxii, 483, n. 1, where Meyer objects to the identification of certain men as having been both *epistrategus* and *praefectus* on the ground that the interval between the two offices in each of the two cases under discussion would be too short. He instances the *cursus* of Julius Alexander as showing a more normal interval, one of 16 years. He does not quarrel with the idea that an *epistrategus* should become *praefectus*.

sence or lack of the *praefectus*. There is a special Greek phrase in the papyri for such a vice-prefect: he was *διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἡγεμονίαν*. The *iuridicus* C. Caecilius Salvianus, who was thus provisionally entrusted with the official functions of the prefect, is called *ὁ κράτιστος δικαιοδότης καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν*, (*B.G.U.* 327, of date 176).¹⁹ But only one instance is known to the writer of the *iuridicus* really rising to the prefecture. It is that of C. Caecina Tuscus, who held the lower office in 51/52 and was not prefect until 65/66. But again this case comes in the not yet regulated period of the first century. A *iuridicus*, L. Volusius Maecianus, who was in office at the time of the rebellion of Avidius Cassius and espoused that cause, was put in charge of the administration of Egypt by the rebel, and in a Berlin papyrus (613, 9) has the title of *ἐπαρχος*. But this was a case of especial exigency, and the high office was a temporary one: Volusius was killed along with his master by the soldiers of Marcus (*Vita Marci*, 25, 4 and *Vita Avid. Cass.* 7, 4).²⁰ There are, so far as now known, no normal instances in our period of the *iuridicus* becoming *praefectus*.

Comparison of the earlier positions held by the incumbents of this office with those held by the prefects and the *epi-strategi* brings out noticeable differences. The careers of three *iuridici* are available, namely, L. Volusius Clemens under Tiberius, L. Baebius Iuncinus in 137-138, and his successor, Sex. Cornelius Dexter.²¹ All three held the usual introductory military positions of the young knights, which were in each case followed by one civil charge preceding the Egyptian office. What that was in the case of Volusius we do not know, but a vacant place was left for it in his inscription. He died in Aquitania while on his way to Egypt, which may account

¹⁹ A. Klein, "Die Stellvertretung im Oberkommando von Aegypten," *Arch. f. Pap.* IV, 148 ff.

²⁰ This is of course not the Volusius Maecianus who was prefect of Egypt in 150-162; see above, p. 101, and cf. Stein, "Die Iuridici Alexandriae," *Arch. f. Pap.* I, 445 f.

²¹ See Stein, *op. cit.*

for the unfinished condition of the stone. Baebius was *praefectus vehiculorum* under Hadrian, who had reorganized the administration of the imperial post and transferred it from the *liberti* to the knights.²² Cornelius Dexter held the office at Alexandria of *procurator Neaspoleos et mausolei* before being *iuridicus*, and afterwards was *procurator Asiae*. This kind of preliminary office is very different from the posts of responsibility which prepared the *praefectus* — and also the *epistrategus* — for their administrative duties. It appears that the differentiation began in the early stages of the civil service.

For the position of the *idiologus*, unfortunately, only one complete *cursus* is available that is certainly reliable. It is that of M. Aquilius Felix, who was *procurator idiologu* in 201. Here differentiation in the early career of civil service is again plain. After the early military offices (especially interesting, since he rose from centurion to the knight's census and career), he did not receive a provincial procuratorship, but held offices of no high rank at Rome. He was *procurator hereditatum patrimonii priuati*, i.e. he was engaged in the administration of the inheritances bequeathed to the emperor, a very modest office which was regarded as merely a branch of the *patrimonium* (Mattingly, *op. cit.* 81.). He was *procurator patrimonii bis*. This office, which was lower in rank in the second century than in the first, fell still lower in the time of Septimius Severus, to which this man belongs. He was then *praefectus classis praetorii Ravennetis*, the naval offices being the lowest of the equestrian praefecturae. The last office in this long list, which must have preceded his office in Egypt, was *ad census* (in the inscription written *a census*) *equitum Romanorum*.²³

²² A second instance of a *iuridicus* who had previously held the office of *praefectus vehiculorum* is to be found in Ulbius Graianus, who held the former office in the eighth year of Marcus and Verus, i.e. 167/168, if the identity of these two officials can be established (cf. *Herm.* XXXII, 226, n. 2).

²³ Mattingly (*op. cit.* 53, n. 3) thinks this a different office from the *a censibus*, whose chief business was the enrollment of Roman knights, but is unable to reach any certain conclusion in the light of the evidence he has.

Here, as in the case of the *iuridici*, the type of career seems not to be such as would naturally lead to the highest administrative office in Egypt.²⁴ Was the difference in the training intentional on the part of the emperor, in order to keep the secondary officials more immediately dependent upon himself, and prevent them from aspiring to the supreme post? If this is true for the *iuridicus* and the *idiologus*, the question still remains why the *epistrategus*, who had just the same kind of training as the *praefectus*, did not in some cases succeed to the higher office. Further investigation may bring the solution of this problem.

²⁴ If the identification of the Eudaemon who appears as *procurator idiologu* in 142 in *Pap. Cattaoui* (see Meyer, *Herm.* XXXII 230, n. 3) with the Eudaemon mentioned in *Vita Hadr.* 15 is correct, the matter of the preliminary cursus of the *idiologus* is not so simple. He held the following list of good positions (*Pros. Imp. Rom.* II, 41): *procurator Hadriani ad diocesan Alexandreae, procurator bibliothecarum Graecarum et Latinarum, ab epistulis Graecis, procurator Lyciae Pamphylicae Galatiae Paphlagoniae Pisidiae Ponti, procurator hereditatium et procurator provinciae Asiae, procurator Syriae.*